

**REMARKS:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-9 and 12-14. Claims 3, 5, 12 and 13 are amended herein and new claims 17 and 18 are added. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 15 and 16 remain cancelled and claims 4 and 14 are cancelled herein without prejudice. The claim amendments are supported by at least page 39, line 7 through page 40, line 15 and FIGS. 27-29 of the application as filed. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 3, 5-9, 12, 13, 17 and 18 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):**

Claims 3-9 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,915,240 (Karpf).

The Examiner maintains the comparison of the MedLkup-client of Karpf with the claimed portal and refers to col. 2, lines 52-59, col. 11, lines 5-13 and 23-34 of Karpf as teaching the same. These portions of Karpf specifically state:

"Each MedLkup-server provides a central database for a single type of medical information, and the MedLkup-client program maintains a local database of medical information for a multiplicity of types of medical information. The MedLkup-client program automatically updates itself from the MedLkup-servers, over the network whenever it is started assuring the user that the information is always up-to-date. The system also allows the user to attach new medical information automatically by specifying the network address of the MedLkup-server. The connection between the MedLkup-client and the MedLkup-server is a non-persistent connection, maintained only for the duration of the time necessary to access the medical information, assuring that a minimum of network and database resources are necessary to maintain the currency of the information. Since the MedLkup-client can access and maintain information contained on multiple MedLkup-servers, information from diverse medical sources can be contained in the same local database."

(col. 2, lines 52-59 of Karpf)

"Table MedTerm 1420 contains the medical dictionary terms and their associated definition. The primary key is a combination of the fields `MedType`, `Term`, `Predecessor`, and `Patriarch` which are unique even if multiple medical dictionaries are maintained in the same database. The `Predecessor` and `Patriarch` fields allow us to fully describe any medical information organized according to a hierarchical structure in the single table MedTerm 1420. The definition and attributes of this table are described in FIG. 15. "

(col. 11, lines 5-13 of Karpf)

"FIG. 15 provides the attributes of the table structures 1500 for the medical dictionary database that are presented in the ER diagram of FIG. 14 and which are located on the MedLkUp-client of FIG. 2. and the MedLkUp-server of FIG. 3. The table MedType 1510, contain descriptive information about the type of medical information, the location of the central server and help facility and the date on which the database was last updated. The table MedTerm 1520, contain all medical terms and definitions for a medical dictionary database, including source information and the date on which specific items were last updated."

(col. 11, lines 13-34 of Karpf)

As can be seen from the above discussion, these portions of Karpf do not discuss "[a] portal server for obtaining information regarding contents from the information disclosing server" where "the portal server" creates "display data for contents object in response to a request from a user of a client" (see discussion of claims below). Accordingly, Karpf does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not established a priori case of anticipation.

In particular, the Karpf system requires a record of data be maintained on each local database of the clients for accessing medical information contained on multiple MedLkUp-servers. As shown in Fig. 15 of Karpf, medical dictionary databases are located on the MedLkUp-client and the MedLkUp-server and each MedLkUp-client directly accesses the MedLkUp-server based on descriptive information entered by a user of the MedLkUp-client (see also, col. 6, lines 47-65).

In contrast to Karpf, the hierarchical structure of folders according to the claimed invention is associated with logical structure of contents and each folder is associated with a template specifying an applet and arguments therefor. For example, as illustrated in FIG. 27 of the present application, the client selects a hot text describing "All-companies", which causes a folder named "All-companies" to be selected and associated with a template shown in FIG. 28 having a particular applet and arguments for that applet. The portal server executes this applet, thereby producing an HTML document shown in FIG. 29.

Independent claim 3 recites, "the information disclosing server storing additional information indicating attributes of the contents stored in the contents storing means and relations among the stored contents." Claim 3 further recites, "portal server obtaining the additional information", "storing the obtained additional information on each contents object by creating folders having a hierarchical structure corresponding to logical structure of the contents

objects, storing the respective attributes of the contents in the folders corresponding thereto, and associating each folder with a template specifying an applet and arguments therefore.”

Accordingly the claimed portal server of claim 3 creates “display data for a specified contents object in response to a request from a user of a client connected with the information disclosing server via the portal server, by executing the applet specified in the template that is associated with the folder corresponding to the specified contents object” and sends the created display data.

Similarly, independent claims 12 and 13 recite, “storing the obtained additional information on each contents object by creating folders having a hierarchical structure corresponding to logical structure of the contents objects, storing the respective attributes of the contents in the folders corresponding thereto, and associating each folder with a template specifying an applet and arguments therefore.” The display data for “a specified contents object” is created in response to a request from the client by executing “the applet specified in the template that is associated with the folder corresponding to the specified contents object” (see claims 12 and 13).

Karpf does not teach or suggest the claimed “portal server” as discussed above, including storing “ additional information on each contents object by creating folders having a hierarchical structure corresponding to logical structure of the contents objects”, “associating each folder with a template specifying an applet and arguments therefore” and “display data for a specified contents object”, as recited in each of independent claims 3, 12 and 13.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Karpf.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Karpf. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 5, “the additional information storage means contains a shortcut by which other folders or contents can be referred to from a predetermined folder.”

Karpf does not teach or suggest “a shortcut by which other folders or contents can be referred to from a predetermined folder”, as recited in claim 5.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**NEW CLAIMS:**

New claim 17 recites that "the applet consults the hierarchical structure of folders to select and process each child contents object that belongs to the contents object corresponding to a template that is currently used."

New claim 18 recites, "generating a hierarchical structure of a first folder including a template specifying an applet and arguments for the applet from a logical structure of contents stored at said server" and "receiving a request from a client system via a portal connecting client systems to said server." Claim 18 further recites, "creating display data corresponding to the client system at the portal responsive to the request and transmitting the display data created to the client system from the portal", where "a second folder having a template is generated for at least one of said client systems for displaying said contents stored at the server."

Karpf does not teach or suggest the above-discussed features including "hierarchical structure" of folders for displaying information to clients, as recited in claims 17 and 18.

It is submitted that new claims 17 and 18 are patentably distinguishable over Karpf.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10/22/2006

By:   
Temnit Afework  
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501